

THE ELEMENT OF POETICAL JUSTICE IN THE FICTION
OF ANTHONY TROLLOPE

Based On A Study Of His Principal Novels

by

Zatella R. Turner

A. B., University of Kansas, 1929

Submitted to the Department of
English and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the Univer-
sity of Kansas in partial ful-
fillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved by:

J. F. Nelson
Instructor in charge

William P. Johnson
Head or Chairman of Dept.

May 29, 1932

This Thesis Is Affectionately Dedicated to My
Parents Whose High Ideals and Untiring Devotion
Are a Source of Inspiration to Me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor John H. Nelson for assistance in the choice of a subject and in the writing of this thesis.

May I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those teachers of the Department of English who have shown an interest in me and an appreciation of my endeavors as a student?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	Poetical Justice--What It Is	1
II	Punishment of the Villains or Unworthy Characters	5
III	Reward of the Conspicuously Virtuous Characters	23
IV	Fate of the Minor Characters	39
V	Final Treatment of the Especially Outstanding Characters	53
VI	Conclusion	61
	Bibliography	70

CHAPTER I

POETICAL JUSTICE--WHAT IT IS

In his frank and revealing Autobiography, Anthony Trollope throws much light on his own ideals and endeavors as a novelist, perhaps, never more clearly than in the passage which deals with the novelist as a teacher. The passage in question follows:

And he [the novelist] must teach whether he wish to teach or no. . . . if he have a conscience, [he] must preach his sermons with the same purpose as the clergyman, and must have his own system of ethics. . . . I think that many have done so; so many that we English novelists may boast as a class that has been the general result of our own work. . . . Speaking, . . . with that absence of self-personality which the dead may claim, I will boast that such has been the result of my own writing. Can any one by searching through the works of the six great English novelists I have named, find a scene, a passage, or a word that would teach a girl to be immodest, or a man to be dishonest? When men in their pages have been described as dishonest and women as immodest, have they not ever been punished?¹

Elsewhere in his work Trollope shows himself to be actively aware of the problem of upholding the moral code in fiction. In Phineas Redux, for example, he writes incidentally that "Poetical justice reached Mr. Quintus Slide of the People's Banner."² The ethical considerations of

1. Anthony Trollope, Autobiography, pp. 192-3.

2. Anthony Trollope, Phineas Redux, Vol. II, p. 358

literature were for Trollope the chief considerations, and in that he was in every respect a representative Victorian, we may expect to find him mirroring the moral code of the late nineteenth century.

Even a child reading Trollope can see that his regular practice always reveals the upright and honorable characters as prospering, and the wicked and unworthy ones as coming to a bad end, or at least getting into sore difficulties. The question as to just how consistent Trollope is, however, in carrying out this principle of just retribution, and whether he regards the working of justice as inevitable has never been studied as thoroughly as it might profitably be. In this thesis, therefore, an attempt will be made to determine the extent and significance of the element of poetical justice in the fiction of Anthony Trollope, an attempt based on a study of his principal novels--showing how the author handles the matter of punishment of the villain or unworthy character, the rewarding of the conspicuously virtuous, and the deciding of the fate of the minor characters. The principal novels to be considered in this study are the Barsetshire series, including The Warden, Barchester Towers, Doctor Thorne, Framley Parsonage, The Small House at Allington, and the Last Chronicle of Barset; The Macdermots of Ballycloran,

Orley Farm, Rachel Ray, The Belton Estate, The Claverings, Phineas Finn, The Vicar of Bullhampton, The Eustace Diamonds, and Phineas Redux.

Before proceeding with the study proper, however, it is necessary to attend to the matter of a definition. Obviously a term is needed to apply to this principle of meting out rewards and punishments by a novelist to his characters. Unfortunately, no absolutely satisfactory term is available. The nearest approach is the phrase, "poetical justice," already used, which is usually spoken of in connection with the drama, but is equally applicable to fiction. In his book, Poetic Justice in the Drama, Mr. M. A. Quinlan interprets poetic justice as that principle of dramatic art which calls for a proper distribution of rewards and punishments within the action of the play. This interpretation, somewhat modified, may be used to designate the principle involved in Trollope's novels, which is to be made the subject of this study. Poetical justice, then, as applied to fiction, is that principle of literary art which calls for a proper distribution of rewards and punishments within the action of the novel.

The studying of this principle will necessitate the answering of such questions as: Does the novelist indicate that just and proper rewards are consistently meted

out in this earthly life? Does he suggest that the wicked always suffer in proportion to their crimes? Is there a just and equitable law at work in the affairs of men which supports the moral code? Finally, if these conditions do not seem to be exactly true, how nearly true are they? In the pages that follow an attempt will be made to answer these questions.

CHAPTER II

PUNISHMENT OF THE VILLAINS OR UNWORTHY CHARACTERS

The most obvious way, perhaps, to study the operation of the moral law in Trollope's fiction is to observe the matter of the punishment he works upon the villain or unworthy character. That both they and others undergo numerous sufferings and misfortunes brought about by the wrongdoing of Trollope's less worthy characters is obvious in most of the novels. Not, however, that Trollope delights in the spectacle of human suffering. On the contrary, he is sympathetic with all humanity, and one suspects that it is with reluctance that he pictured even his unworthy men and women as suffering. He sincerely believed that the individual man or woman is at heart an honorable, kindly creature, and became a hardened, scheming creature only upon great temptation. He believed no less, however, that whatever the cause of transgression, that transgression was not to be passed over lightly.

Consider, for example, the illustration found in Mr. Obadiah Slope of Barchester Towers. The title of villain can be applied to him without any apology for the use of the term. He was determined, as Bishop Proudie's chaplain, to become, in effect, the master of Barchester. He knew

that he must fight for this power, as Mrs. Proudie, the bishop's wife, was also a strong contender for the position of ruler of the diocese. But Mr. Slope's personality was such that it aided him in his attempt.

Though he can stoop to fawn and stoop low indeed if need be, he has still within him the power to assume the tyrant; and with the power he has certainly the wish. . . . He is gifted with a certain kind of pulpit eloquence; not likely to be persuasive with men, but powerful with the softer sex! ¹

Mr. Slope achieved his first victory when he preached in the cathedral on the occasion of Bishop Proudie's inauguration. Choosing for his text, "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth," ² he proceeded to preach, not according to St. Paul, but to Obadiah Slope. As a result, all of Barchester was in a tumult.

Mr. Quiverful, rector of Puddingdale, who had a wife and fourteen children for whom to provide, was in accord with Mr. Slope, who decided out of gratitude to make Mr. Quiverful the warden of Hiram's Hospital. At the bishop's suggestion, Mr. Slope tendered the wardenship to Mr. Harding again, but in such a manner and with so many stipulations, that Mr. Harding did not readily accept, which apparent indifference led Mr. Slope to say that he had refused the position. Accordingly, he proffered the position to Mr. Quiverful, who was willing to accept, if he

1.

Anthony Trollope, Barchester Towers, Vol. I, p. 33.

2.

Ibid., p. 61.

were certain that Mr. Harding had declined. Mr. Slope, learning in the meantime, that Eleanor Bold was possessed of a large income, decided to return Mr. Harding to his old place and to win Eleanor Bold for his wife. For this reason he set about to make himself agreeable to her, posing as a meek, charitable, and sincere clergyman. However, retreat was not such an easy matter, for Mrs. Proudie had become interested in the Quiverfuls. At this juncture, Mr. Slope was unable to give further consideration to the matter of Hiram's Hospital, as his energy was being spent in an effort to gain for himself the position of dean of Barchester. In order to secure Bishop Proudie's endorsement, it was necessary for him to withdraw his interest in the hospital, which left Mrs. Proudie victor in the matter. But Mr. Slope had become so abominable to Mrs. Proudie in his efforts to control the diocese, that she refused to allow the bishop to endorse him for the office of dean, and besides, showed him the utter folly of retaining such an impertinent person as his chaplain. Moreover, Eleanor Bold rejected his proposal of marriage, and in vexation gave him a stinging slap on the cheek, which galled him terribly. His cup of bitterness soon ran to overflowing; for it was soon announced publicly that Mr. Harding had been elected dean of Barchester, but his modesty prevented his accepting the new position.

Nevertheless, an appointment, equally bitter to Mr. Slope, was made in the person of Mr. Arabin, protege of Archdeacon Grantly, rector of St. Ewold, and fiancé of Eleanor Bold. Mr. Slope did not despair in his misery; upon being ousted from the bishop's service, and upon failure to get the coveted office, he made himself agreeable to the widow of a rich sugar-refiner in London. In a very short while, he had secured for himself a church in the vicinity of the New Road in London, and became known as one of the most eloquent preachers and pious clergymen in that part of the metropolis. In short, Mr. Slope met a sharp rebuff in his efforts to rule the Barseshire clergy; but it should be noticed that Trollope did not reduce him to permanent beggary nor send him to prison.

In comparison with the relatively flagrant villainy of Mr. Slope, consider the mild and partially unintentional wrongdoing of Dr. Bold in The Warden. Dr. Bold sins less, but the frustration of his plans is also less complete. Ironically enough, Dr. Bold becomes an unworthy character through a sincere and fervent effort to mend mankind, and to correct all abuses, whether state, church, corporation, medical, or general abuses in the world at large. But his passion for reform wounded one

of Trollope's most admirable characters, Mr. Septimus Harding, warden of Hiram's Hospital, which hospital was founded by the beneficence of Mr. John Hiram. According to the will, this John Hiram who made money in Barchester as a woolstaper, left his house and certain lands for the support of twelve superannuated woolcarders, who were to be under the supervision of a warden. At the present time, the position of warden of Hiram's Hospital had become one of the most coveted of the snug clerical sinecures attached to the church. Besides somewhat comfortable living conditions, the old men, for whose benefit the will was made, received one shilling and four pence a day for pocket change. It was to this state of affairs that Dr. Bold objected. Mr. Harding, who had held the position of warden for the last ten years, became very uncomfortable and uneasy in mind under the investigations conducted by Dr. Bold. However, it was not until the "Jupiter," that all powerful organ of the press, had taken up Dr. Bold's cause, that Mr. Harding decided that he must defend his position. It was this passage published as an editorial in the "Jupiter," which wrought such havoc with his thoughts:

On what foundation, moral or divine, traditional or legal, is grounded the warden's claim to the large income he receives for doing nothing? . . . Does he ever ask himself, when he stretches wide his

clerical palm to receive the pay of some dozen of the working clergy, for what service he is so remunerated? Does his conscience ever entertain the question of his right to such subsidies? Or is it possible that the subject never so presents itself to his mind; that he has received for many years, and intends, should God spare him, to receive for years to come, these fruits of the industrious piety of past ages, indifferent as to any right on his part or of any injustice to others.³

Bold was not altogether happy in his triumph, for he had wounded the father of the woman whom he loved, but it gave him a feeling of joy to have his cause taken up by so powerful an advocate. Nevertheless, his position was far from being enviable. When he was accosted by Eleanor Harding in behalf of her father, he did the only gentlemanly thing that could be done--withdrew his suit. On the contrary, the "Jupiter," in need of news, continued to make the most of the controversy.

In great despair, Mr. Harding consulted Sir Abraham Haphazard, the great London barrister. Failing to secure a favorable opinion from him, Mr. Harding resigned the wardenship of Hiram's Hospital, in an effort to be true to his better self. Within three months after this event, Dr. John Bold and Eleanor Harding were happily married, but Dr. John Bold died soon afterwards. A son, in whom John Bold might have found much happiness, was born after his death.

In the class of wilfull wrongdoers, Mr. Nathaniel

Sowerby, Esquire, merits a place, for he wrought much havoc in Framley Parsonage. He intentionally brought ruin, or near ruin, upon two men who regarded him as a friend. Mr. Sowerby was an unmarried man of fifty, which condition was in itself undesirable; moreover, he was a very poor man, having spent much of his money on electioneering and more of it in gambling. But what was much worse than either of these offenses, he had gained the confidence of Lord Ludovic Lufton and Mark Roberts, the vicar, both of Framley Parsonage, much to the disapproval of their families, who considered Nathaniel Sowerby unfit company for gentlemen. Lord Lufton was desirous of disposing of a part of the family estate in Oxfordshire to settle an outstanding, but confidential debt between him and Sowerby. Lady Lufton, desirous of keeping the family estate intact, settled the debt at some inconvenience to herself. But alas! Mark Roberts, the vicar of Framley Parsonage, allowed Sowerby to cajole him into signing a note for four hundred pounds, which amounted to almost half-a-year's income. Sowerby made no effort to redeem the note at the time of its expiration and Mark Roberts, foolishly enough, signed another note for five hundred pounds, which he supposed was simply a renewal of the old note, plus a margin for renewal expenses. Sowerby, in an effort to amend bad matters, was instrumental in securing for Mark

Robarts the stall of prebendary of Barsetshire. Robarts's vexation knew no limit when Lord Lufton informed him that people were saying his stall cost a thousand pounds. At last both notes were presented to Robarts for redemption; he could do nothing and would make no attempt to do anything. Consequently, the bailiffs came on the appointed day and took possession of the parsonage. Mark Robarts's anguish reached its lowest ebb when these base men came in to despoil his home, to shame and humiliate him before his family and his friends, and worst of all, his enemies. But Lady Lufton again played the good Samaritan and Mark Robarts was saved from complete disaster.

In the meantime, Sowerby was busy electioneering. At the close of the election, however, Sowerby found himself banished from the representation of West Barchester, banished forever, after having held the country for twenty five years. Moreover, he was forced to live as a tenant in his own house, for there was a heavy mortgage on it of one hundred thousand pounds. His spirit became completely broken; he relinquished all claims to his Chaldicote property, and vanished entirely from the life and scenes that he loved so well.

In The Small House at Allington, we are introduced to a fourth example of villainy, which was contrived by

Trollope's most despicable character, Adolphus Crosbie, who was engaged to Lily Dale, one of Trollope's conspicuously outstanding heroines. Crosbie's enthusiasm for the engagement waned immediately when he learned that Lily's uncle, the squire of Allington, had no intention of making a marriage settlement upon her. Crosbie was a Beau Brummel and to him a certain standard of living was a necessity. He asked himself this question repeatedly-- "Could it be that he, Adolphus Crosbie, should settle down on the north side of the New Road as a married man, with eight hundred a year?"⁴ Lily Dale was sincerely loved by John Eames, a childhood sweetheart, and to him the announcement of her engagement was like wormwood. Crosbie accepted an invitation to Courcy Castle; and in the midst of such a noble assemblage, he forgot Lily Dale. With no thought as to the injury that he might inflict upon Lily, Crosbie became engaged to Lady Alexandrina De Courcy, believing himself unable to forswear such brilliant society. Crosbie realized that to jilt Lily Dale was within his power, but he knew well that he dare not jilt Lady Alexandrina De Courcy. In the meantime, Lily Dale was still happy in her love. At this time, Crosbie received a much desired promotion from clerk to secretary in the General Committee Office, but this promotion brought him no happiness at this

time, for he had still to write to Lily Dale to inform her of his changed plans. With a greatly troubled conscience, Crosbie finally wrote the letter to Lily Dale. Lily bore the unhappy news well. Her family decided to take no steps to punish Crosbie, leaving it to his conscience to give him a thorough whipping. But John Eames thought differently about the matter and attacked Crosbie in a railroad station, when he came upon him unexpectedly. The skirmish lasted only three minutes, but Eames contrived to give Crosbie one telling blow in his right eye, which served as proof to the world that he had been thrashed. Crosbie was held up to the scorn and ridicule of both his friends and the newspapers. Nor was Crosbie happy in his marriage preparations, for the numerous De Courcys simply told him what to do, and he did it. Mortimer Gazeble, his future brother-in-law, even went so far as to secure a loan for him, arranging that he pay it back at the rate of a hundred and fifty a year with four per cent.

Crosbie's married life was a failure. His wife never reconciled herself to her impoverished state, and after just ten weeks of marriage, she joined her sister and mother at Baden-Baden, never again returning to her husband's house. Crosbie felt that his liberty had been purchased cheaply, even though he was forced to make a settle-

ment on his wife that reduced his income to six hundred a year. But his old buoyancy had left him, and never again did he become the Beau Brummel of St. James Street.

In Trollope's first literary attempt, The Macdermots of Ballycloran, which is, by the way an Irish novel, we encounter a different type of villain, not only oily and suave, as Mr. Obadiah Slope had been, but also carefree. Captain Myles Ussher, a federal policeman, was deeply loved by Feemy Macdermot, for whom he possessed all the chief ornaments of her novel heroes.

He was handsome, he carried arms, was a man of danger and talked deeds of courage; he wore a uniform, he rode more gracefully, talked more fluently, and seemed a more mighty personage, than any other one whom Feemy usually met. Besides, he gloried in the title of Captain, and would not that be sufficient to engage the heart of any girl? let alone any Irish girl, to whom the ornaments of arms are always dear?⁵

But the infatuation was all on Feemy's side; consequently she incurred the displeasure of her father, her brother, her parish priest, and her neighborly well-wisher, Mrs. McKeon. Feemy always assumed the air of an injured person on these occasions, and, to the best of her abilities, she vindicated her absent lover.

Captain Myles Ussher received a promotion that necessitated his leaving Ballycloran. Although he was unhappy when he thought about the sadness that his news

was bound to bring Feemy, he was pleased to depart. He had made up his mind, nevertheless, that nothing would induce him to marry her. On the other hand, Feemy gave no thought to a separation between her and her lover. Ussher remained staunch in his determination, and in his reply to Feemy's numerous entreaties about marriage, his villainy was clearly shown.

Besides, Feemy, I wouldn't be married in this place, after what your brother and Father John said to me last night. If we are to be married at all, it can't be here. . . . To tell you the whole truth, Feemy, they wouldn't let a man take his rise from one rank to another if he's married. ⁶

Poor foolish Feemy! In desperation she consented to elope with Ussher, relying upon a tardy marriage to make reparations for the disgrace she would bring upon herself and family. At the appointed hour, Feemy's brother Thaddy also waited for Ussher; and when he hurriedly dismounted Thaddeus gave him a crushing blow on the skull, from which blow he died before aid could reach him.

Thaddeus paid for this crime with his life, as he was found guilty of premeditated homicide and sentenced to execution. Feemy, grief stricken over her lover's death, horrified by her brother's deed, and shamed by her own condition which she thought was known to everyone, died from heart trouble, while the court eagerly awaited her

appearance on the witness stand. Although it would seem upon first consideration that Trollope was too severe on Feemy, yet he spared her much future misery and humiliation, as her sad plight would soon have become known to everyone. Thaddeus was likewise too severely treated, perhaps, but he should have made no attempt to take the law into his own hands. Trollope in this novel makes the path of the transgressor a thorny one, exacting the supreme penalty from all those who had sinned.

A sixth example of villainy occurs in The Eustace Diamonds, in which Mr. Benjamin, a jeweler, subjected many people to the annoyances of the police authorities for the stealing of a diamond necklace worth ten thousand pounds belonging to Lady Eustace, which necklace he himself had stolen. Mr. Benjamin was aware of the fact that the ownership of the diamonds was the cause of a legal dispute among the Eustace heirs. He also knew that these diamonds were carried around in an iron safe by Lady Eustace instead of being placed in a vault, for she feared some untrustworthy banker or jeweler would turn them over to her enemies. Mr. Benjamin secured as his accomplice Lady Eustace's maid, who arranged for the theft of the necklace. A number of innocent people were suspected and hu-

miliated by the rigid questioning to which the police subjected them. However, the maid, who was weak enough to betray her mistress' confidence, was equally weak in betraying her confederate; for when she herself was accused of the theft, she readily involved Mr. Benjamin. Although Mr. Benjamin had been able to dispose of the diamonds in the interim, and was not obliged to stand trial for their theft as Lady Eustace did not appear in court against him, his reputation as a reliable jeweler was forfeited, and his vile practices were flaunted to the world.

The last unworthy character, who should be considered here, is not a bold, obtrusive man, but rather a quiet, sensible, clever woman, Lady Mason, whose villainous act has given rise to the story which is unravelled in Orley Farm. It has never been thoroughly understood why old Sir Joseph Mason attached a codicil to his will on his death bed, leaving the vast estate of Orley Farm, not to his elder son, Joseph Mason, Esquire of Groby Park, but to his infant son of a second marriage, Lucius Mason. The point to be debated at the trial by the contending lawyers was the authenticity of the codicil which was in the wife's handwriting. Joseph Mason had bitterly contested the case and lost, for the family lawyer was dead, and the widow's testimony was taken as

conclusive evidence that nothing was amiss. Numerous trials had proved that the family lawyer was present at the time, but was suffering from the gout in his hand; consequently he had authorized Lady Mason to write the codicil which was witnessed by two other persons of the Mason household.

Lady Mason had earned the respect of all those around her by the way in which she bore herself in the painful days of the trial, and also in those of her success, especially by the manner in which she gave her evidence. And thus, though she had not been much noticed by her neighbors during the short period of her married life, she was visited as a widow by many of the more respectable people around her. . . . Among those who took her by the hand in the time of her great trouble was Sir Peregrine Orme of The Cleeve. 7

Just when Lady Mason had begun to feel triumphant in the possession of Orley Farm as her son Lucius would soon be of age, she was confronted with the horrors of another trial concerning the lawful ownership of Orley Farm. Lady Mason proposed to buy off Mr. Dockwrath, the instigator of her trouble at any price. He refused, expecting larger remunerations. Sir Peregrine, an esteemed squire of the neighborhood, offered Lady Mason the protection of marriage. Overwhelmed by his generosity, Lady Mason confessed her guilt. "Sir Peregrine, I am guilty. . . . Guilty of all this with which they charge me."

7.

Anthony Trollope, Orley Farm, Vol. I, p. 21

8.

Anthony Trollope, Orley Farm, Vol. II, p. 228

Although at the trial, the jury did not convict Lady Mason of perjury, she was punished, nevertheless. She lost the esteem of her revered friends, Sir Peregrine Orme and his daughter-in-law, Mrs. Orme. Above all, she lost the respect of her son, for whom the perjury and forgery had been committed. More than that, her son bestowed Orley Farm on the rightful heir, Joseph Mason, which act was iron-clad proof to the world that she was guilty, and she and her son sought refuge in Germany. Mr. Dockwrath, the offender in this case, received no consideration in the settlement. Moreover, he was obliged to spend money, but to no avail.

After the trial, Lady Mason was forced to watch, at close range, her house of cards tumble down before her.

Early in her days when the world was yet beginning to her, she had done one evil deed, and from that time up to those days of her trial she had been the victim of one incessant struggle to appear before the world as though that deed had not been done--to appear innocent of it before the world, but, beyond all things, innocent of it before her son. . . . For twenty years she had striven with a labor that had been all but endurable; and now she had failed, and every one knew her for what she was. ⁹

Thus Lady Mason was conquered, shown up before her friends for what she was, and made to suffer for her sins.

In the light of these seven examples, what is one to say about Trollope's attitude toward his unworthy charac-

9. Anthony Trollope, *Orley Farm*, Vol. III, p. 328.

ter? Does he suggest that the wicked always suffer in proportion to their crime? In answer to this question, one can say only that Trollope metes out punishment to his unworthy characters roughly commensurate with their crimes, but in a way which is, on the whole, sympathetic. One can detect a softening influence at work in the interim which elapsed between the publication of The Macdermots of Ballycloran and The Warden, an influence which continued to exert itself throughout his later life. In his first novel, the penalty of death is exacted from all the transgressors. They die with their sins upon their heads. In The Warden, however, the tragic element is subdued. Dr. John Bold dies, to be sure, but his death is one not of violence, but rather of peaceful surrender. When Dr. Bold died, the novelist showed him as passing away peacefully and not as painfully yielding up his life as punishment for his wrongdoing to Mr. Harding in connection with

Hiram's Hospital. More significant of the mellowing in Trollope's attitude is the situation found in the next novel, Barchester Towers. Here Mr. Obadiah Slope is punished simply by being denied the advancements in life that he coveted, being forced to see his dearest enemy occupying the place that he so greatly desired. Nathaniel Sowerby of Framley Parsonage and Adolphus Crosbie of The Small

House at Allington were ostracized from the society that was so vital to their happiness. The loss of a good reputation was suffered by Mr. Benjamin in The Eustace Diamonds, and by Lady Mason in Orley Farm. In nearly all instances, Trollope has brought about a retribution that was justifiable. Without doubt, poetical justice is meted out to Trollope's unworthy characters, approximately, in proportion to the seriousness of the wrongdoing, although, as already pointed out, sinners are dealt with somewhat less severely as the novelist progressed from his earlier work. Thus, on the whole, Trollope upheld the view that men's sins lead to punishment, not merely in the world to come, but also in a measure at least, during their lives on earth.

CHAPTER III

REWARD OF THE CONSPICUOUSLY VIRTUOUS CHARACTERS

Although it is with reluctance that Trollope punishes his unworthy character, it is with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction that he rewards his conspicuously virtuous ones. He delights in portraying the demure heroine who has been persecuted by her intimates, but who, at last, triumphs over all obstacles to her happiness. In numerous instances, he depicts the virtuous, affable young lady of ordinary family loved by a scion of an aristocratic family, who, of course, object to the son's choice, but who are at last compelled to yield because of the winsome ways of the young lady. To this class of heroines belong Mary Thorne, Lucy Robarts, Grace Crawley, Lucy Morris, and Rachel Ray. In only one instance does Trollope allow a virtuous character to suffer complete disappointment, yet, even in this exception, there is seen one element of good fortune; the suitor of the deserving heroine, Lily Dale, is unworthy of her, and by showing Lily as escaping the desired match, the novelist actually points to her good fortune, even though the heroine did not know it was good.

The treatment accorded Lily Dale, in fact, well illustrates Trollope's attitude toward the whole class to which it belongs. Lily Dale knew nothing about money, nor the

value that the world attached to its possession, and she was too happy in her good fortune to care to learn about it. But Adolphus Crosbie, to whom she was engaged, was not so happy, for he had done the very thing that he planned never to do. "According to his plan of life he was to have eschewed marriage, and to have allowed himself to regard it as a possible event only under the circumstances of wealth, rank, and beauty all coming in his way together."¹ Lily had a foreboding of some impending disaster on the day of Crosbie's departure from Allington, and within just two weeks, Adolphus Crosbie had become engaged to Lady Alexandrine De Courcy. Lily received the news with fortitude. She retained all her past love for Crosbie, in spite of the fact that he had jilted her. After the death of his wife, Crosbie again made Lily an offer of marriage, which offer she positively refused. She preferred to cherish her past love for Crosbie, rather than to marry him, and find that she had not, after all, loved the ideal prince.

In contrast to the fate of Lily Dale, whose grief appeared less sorrowful, because she had a kind and understanding mother and sister to solace her, let us consider the plight of Lucy Morris, the heroine of The

¹. Anthony Trollope, The Small House at Allington, Vol. I, p. 73

Eustace Diamonds, a plight nearer to being tragic than that of any of Trollope's conspicuously virtuous characters. Lucy Morris was dependent solely upon the kindness of her employer, Lady Fawn, who could not always appreciate her point of view. But unlike Lily Dale, Lucy found happiness in spite of all of her previous sorrows. Frank Greystock, Lucy's distant cousin, was in love with her, but "Mrs. Greystock had aspirations in the direction of filthy lucre on behalf of her children, or at least on behalf of this special child and she did think it would be nice if Frank would marry an heiress."² Notwithstanding the attitude taken by his mother, or the subtle hints of Lady Fawn as to the indiscretion of such a marriage, Frank Greystock persisted in his love for Lucy. Circumstances required Lucy to either defend Frank or to listen to harsh abuses of him by Lord Fawn, who was vexed, extremely so, because Frank chose to differ with him in some of his parliamentary speeches. Lucy chose to defend Frank, and on one occasion, she so completely forgot herself, that she knew everyone would be more comfortable, if she found employment else-where. Much to Frank's displeasure, his mother would not accept Lucy into her home as his fiancée, and it was with great difficulty that a position

2.

Anthony Trollope, *The Eustace Diamonds*, p. 18.

was secured for six months with Lady Linlithgow, a veritable old crank. After this, Lucy was compelled to return to Lady Fawn's home, but only for a short time, as Mrs. Greystock soon relented, and received Lucy into her home as her son's fiancée. After spending fifteen happy months there, Frank and Lucy married. No brighter face than Lucy's ever shone on her wedding day. "No brighter face ever looked into another to seek sympathy there, either in mirth or woe. There was a gleam in her eyes that was almost magnetic, so sure was she to obtain by it that community of interest, which she desired,--though it were but a moment." ³ Lucy Morris was deserving, and in spite of her tribulations, she at last triumphed.

Another completely virtuous character, Rachel Ray, suffered in a threefold way in her innocence, although she eventually found happiness in life. She was not only subjected to the tyranny of her lover's mother, but to the contempt of her dearest friends, the Tappits, and what was far worse, to the outlandish indignation of her sister, Mrs. Prime, who went so far as to move from her mother's house to escape pollution from Rachel Ray. Rachel, on the other hand, was guilty of no wrongdoing. She had simply allowed the young man from the brewery, who was, by the way, the Misses Tappitt's cousin, to walk home with her

and to show her some attention. This, however, was displeasing to the Misses Tappitts, for they themselves had become interested in him. The Tappitts, who were well established residents of Baslehurst, and who owned the brewery, were kind to Rachel when they could assume a patronizing role; but, when Luke Rowan decided to pay Rachel some attention, they looked upon her as a nice, but poor girl, unworthy of their friendship. Much to their vexation and disgust, Rachel Ray was the undisputed belle of a very elaborate ball which they gave. Rachel's presence there, however, was the result of much persuasion on her part. Her presence was assured only after the Rev. Mr. Comfort had given his approval, and his daughter, Mrs. Butler Cornbury had condescended to take her.

In spite of all of the contrivances of his cousins, Luke Rowan did pay court to Rachel Ray, and he declared his sincere intentions to her mother. His mother, however, who was very averse to such a marriage, called on Mrs. Ray to voice her disapproval, and to show her the folly of such a union. She went so far as to insinuate that her son was not sincere in his proposal.

I think it's quite understood in the world, that a young lady is not to take a gentleman at his first word. . . . In the first place the young people don't know anything of each other; absolutely nothing at all. And then,--but I'm sure I don't want to insist on any

differences that there may be in their positions in life. Only you must be aware of this, Mrs. Ray, that such a marriage as that would be very injurious to a young man like my son Luke.

It was quite natural that Mrs. Ray should be cautious after this, and she was, extremely so. Although Rachel received a very cordial letter from Rowan, postmarked London, where he had been called on business, Mrs. Ray did not think it expedient that Rachel answer it. Moreover, the Rev. Mr. Comfort was again consulted, and neither did he think it judicious for Rachel to correspond with Luke Rowan in view of existing circumstances. Thus Rachel had to forgo the pleasure of even corresponding with her lover. Rachel's apparent indifference provoked Mark, and he refrained from further correspondence with her. The Tappitts, as soon as it looked as though Rowan had survived his infatuation for Rachel Ray, wished a second time to become intimate with her; but it was she, who this time, disdained their overtures.

Through the kind auspices of Mrs. Butler Cornbury, a reconciliation was affected between the two lovers. It was discovered, in the meantime, that Luke, through inheritance, was entitled to half ownership in the brewery. Rather than submit to the enemy of the family, Mr. Tappitt retired on a substantial pension, going so far as to move away from Baslehurst. Consequently, the commodious brewery

residence was occupied by the poor, but nice Rachel Ray as Mrs. Luke Rowan.

In The Last Chronicle of Barset, The heroine, Grace Crawley, triumphed in spite of the opposition of her lover's parents. Archdeacon Grantly and Mrs. Grantly had never looked upon a match between their son, Henry, and Grace Crawley with favor; but, when Grace Crawley's father, a clergyman, had been accused of stealing a check for twenty pounds, they looked upon the probable marriage of their son to Grace Crawley with abhorrence. Major Grantly proved himself his father's son by the resolute manner in which he received his rebuffs.

I claim the privilege of a man of my age to do as I please in such a matter as marriage. Miss Crawley is a lady. Her father is a clergyman, as is mine. Her father's oldest friend is my uncle. There is nothing on earth against her except her poverty. I do not think I ever heard of such cruelty on a father's part.⁵

Mr. Crawley was considered guilty of the theft by all of his associates, and quite naturally, his family was placed under stigma. Grace resigned her position as substitute teacher at the Misses Prettymans' school, for she knew that her father's conduct was being discussed by all the girls in the school, who, she thought, looked at her askance. Grace felt that everyone cast reproachful glances at her when her father was bound over for trial at the next

5.

Anthony Trollope, The Last Chronicle of Barset,
Vol. II, p. 136.

assizes. Mrs. Crawley, in an effort to spare Grace as much humiliation as possible, arranged for her to visit Lily Dale, but Grace spent only a short time at Allington, as she longed to comfort her wretched parents.

Archdeacon Grantly called on Grace Crawley for the express purpose of hurling at her all the contempt that he felt for her. On the contrary, he was completely overwhelmed by the spirit she showed when he alluded to her father in a disparaging manner. He became endeared to her when she declared she did not mind being poor, but she did mind having everyone brand her father as a thief. He fell in love with her when she assured him that she would never marry his son as long as her father was suspected by anyone in the world of being a thief. He departed from her with the understanding that as soon as the cloud passed away from her father, she should come to them and be their daughter. The cloud passed away, and accordingly, Grace was accepted into the archdeacon's family with every indication of respect, for did not Dr. Grantly present her a little pony carriage upon her wedding day? Grace Crawley's loyalty to her parents, and her tenacious clinging to whatever self-respect she could command commended her to everyone, and her happy marriage to Major Grantly was more than deserved.

Lucy Robarts, like Grace Crawley, was subjected to the personal tyranny of her suitor's parent. Lady Lufton, who had always ruled Framley Parsonage with an indomitable will, considered it her unquestionable duty to take steps to eradicate such an improper state of affairs as a courtship between her son, Lord Ludovic Lufton, the heir of the Lufton estates, and Lucy Robarts, her vicar's sister.

She broached the matter to the vicar's wife and immediately Lucy's persecution began, for Fanny Robarts, Lucy's sister-in-law, accused her of flirting with Lord Lufton.

Lucy, in her passionate reply to Fanny, showed what spirit she could muster when attacked.

I don't know whether it would be anything wrong, even if I were to fall in love with him. I wonder whether they cautioned Griselda Grantly when she was here? I suppose when young lords go about, all the girls are cautioned as a matter of course. Why do they not label him dangerous? . . . Poison should be the word with any one so fatal as Lord Lufton; and he ought to be made up of some particular color for fear he should be swallowed in mistake.⁶

Lucy's declamation to Lord Lufton, that she did not love him, caused both of them much anguish. She confined herself to the house after that, for fear that she might encounter Lord Lufton, and find herself unable to resist his entreaties. Lord Lufton persisted in his love for Lucy, declaring that it should be Lucy, Lucy before all the world. Lucy remained staunch and refused to accept Lord Lufton unless his mother asked her to be her son's wife. Lady Luft-

6.

Anthony Trollope, Framley Parsonage, p. 158.

ton decided to talk with the young lady in her most eloquent and stern manner, but in the actual encounter, she had to own herself beaten. How differently things had arranged themselves from her plans! She had always pictured herself choosing a wife for her son, for whom she would dethrone herself in favor of the new queen. When she realized her protests were of no avail, she yielded, but not without an inward struggle. Lady Lufton was a kind woman at heart, simply anxious for her only son's welfare. She abdicated her throne in the kindest spirit. She did not require Lucy to entreat for her love, but bestowed it upon her most graciously.

The last conspicuously virtuous character to be considered in our study is Mary Thorne, whose goodness is felt in the Barsetshire novel, Dr. Thorne. Although Mary Thorne was reared by her uncle, Dr. Thorne, she lacked no feminine charms, nor accomplishments that would have indicated that her home life was not as complete as it would have been had she lived in a family of brothers and sisters, father and mother. Although genuine friendship existed between Dr. Thorne and Mr. Frank Gresham, Esquire, Lady Arabella Gresham was not so sincere in her cordiality. Nevertheless, Mary Thorne was allowed to listen in three times a week on the music lessons given the Lady Arabella's

daughters by a music-master from Barchester. Thus Mary learned to play. While Lady Arabella did not object to the intimacy that seemed to exist between her daughters and Mary Thorne, as she felt that they understood and appreciated the difference between their rank and Mary's position, she did object to any intimacy between Mary and her son, Frank.

The pride of the Gresham family was not the several daughters, but Francis Newbold Gresham, the only son and heir, whose coming of age was an important and grave occasion to his family and his august relatives, the De Courcys of Courcy Castle. Frank's father had squandered the estate, and it behooved Frank, if he wished to maintain a position of eminence in the community, to retrieve the family fortune. Hence, it was expedient for him to marry not blood, nor beauty, but money. It was the august De Courcys who first perceived the necessity of severing the friendly relations between Mary Thorne and the Greshams. The Greshams and De Courcys began to persecute Mary, and to harass Frank as to the necessity of his marrying money, as soon as they discerned that he and Mary exchanged too many pleasantries at his coming-of-age celebration. Mary, however, had already declined Frank Gresham's offer of marriage previous to the time that his family became so upset over their friendliness. Nevertheless,

Mary's refusal had not been made without effort. Frank was taken to Courcy Castle in order to remove him from Mary Thorne's presence, and to give him an opportunity to become acquainted with, and to propose to a Miss Dunstable, who was possessed of fabulous wealth, although she was some twelve years his senior.

Lady Arabella resolved to approach Dr. Thorne in regard to Mary and Frank and to impress upon him, in no uncertain terms, her view that under no circumstances should Mary's visits be continued at Greshamsbury. Lady Arabella considered herself fortunate in the interview, for in ten minutes she was given assurance that both Dr. Thorne and Mary's visits would be discontinued. Frank returned from Courcy Castle more determined than ever to marry Mary in spite of his family's objections, for had not Miss Dunstable encouraged him in his love for Mary? Frank was told the sordid story of Mary's birth in an effort to dissuade him from his love for her, but his sole reply was, "To me, father, it is told too late. It can now have no effect on me. Indeed, it could have had no effect had I heard it ever so soon," ⁷ As a last recourse, Lady Arabella planned to call on Mary Thorne and to shame her out of her folly, but it was she who was shamed out of her own

7.

Anthony Trollope, Dr. Thorne, p. 407.

folly. But Frank Gresham and Mary Thorne were much too deserving to have their hopes blighted. Sir Louis Scatterd, Mary's rich, lately discovered cousin, died from intemperance as his father had done three years ago, and all the vast property of Sir Roger Scatterd, the queen's railroad builder, passed to Mary Thorne, his niece, and sister's eldest child. Mary's joy knew no bounds, not because money was essential to her happiness, but because it was necessary to prove to the Greshams and De Courcys that Frank was not throwing himself away on a mere nobody.

Like Rachel Ray, Grace Crawley, Lucy Roberts, and Lucy Morris, Mary Thorne also overcame all obstacles to her happiness, but her triumph was much more complete than theirs. She was not merely just taken into the family, who at last laid aside all objections to the marriage because the son was persistent in his love, but she was the good angel, the good Samaritan who saved the family from complete annihilation in the world in which it had always played the leading role, by supplying it with the money necessary to reestablish and maintain itself in a position of eminence.

It is to be noted that Trollope's conspicuously virtuous characters are all, with a single exception, allowed to win happiness from life. One feels that the nov-

elist shows the attainment of this happiness, not in a mechanical forced way, but makes it the not improbable solution of the problem that gave meaning to the novel. To be sure, the success which comes to Trollope's virtuous characters does not always strike one as inevitable and the absolutely logical result of what has preceded; but in setting forth this success, Trollope makes the happening seem believable, and certainly desirable from the point of view of the ordinary reader.

Had Trollope done otherwise than to allow Lily Dale in The Small House at Allington to remain an old maid, he would not have meted out poetical justice to Adolphus Crosbie, who was undeserving of such good fortune as to marry her. Although Rachel Ray was ill treated by her sister, her best friends, and her lover's mother, she was guilty of no wrongdoing, and the novel, Rachel Ray, would have had a needlessly painful ending, had not Luke Rowan married Rachel Ray. Lucy Morris's virtues stood out conspicuously against Lady Eustace's vices, and the great contrast enabled Frank Greystock to make the wiser choice between the two women; consequently, The Eustace Diamonds ended happily for all the deserving characters. Grace Crawley remained loyal to her parents in The Last Chronicle of Barset, and such loyalty won for her the admiration of Archdeacon Grantly, which admiration led to

his sanction of his son's marriage to her. Lady Lufton, who had always ruled Framley Parsonage with an unconquerable will, overreached herself, and was at last made to relinquish some of her claims in favor of the winsome Lucy Roberts of Framley Parsonage. Mary Thorne's triumph over all obstacles to her happiness was complete, and her marriage to Gresham, not as a lovable, poor girl, but rather as a lovable, wealthy girl, makes Dr. Thorne a fitting novel for the close of the study of the conspicuously virtuous characters. Thus it is apparent in Trollope's scheme of things that the meting out of rewards to the virtuous is of more consequence than the punishment of the villains.

CHAPTER IV

THE FATE OF THE MINOR CHARACTERS

The careful reader of Trollope's novels will readily discern that the element of poetical justice is evident in the final disposition he makes of the minor characters, as well as in the final treatment of the most important ones. Trollope firmly believed that all men were subjected to the moral law, regardless of their status. Both the rewarding and the punishment of the minor character are in the large, in keeping with the merit or villainy of the respective character. The virtuous persons are ultimately rewarded, but in several instances only after overcoming many obstacles to their happiness. The less unworthy ones are punished in several ways; sometimes they are humiliated before their friends; again they are denied a much coveted honor; and in one instance, death is the penalty exacted from the wrongdoers.

Among the characters subjected to humiliation was Mr. Moffat, the tailor's son, who, in Dr. Thorne, jilted Augusta Gresham of Greshamsbury. He thought that the only punishment likely to be inflicted upon him for such a cowardly act was the squire's violence and the enmity of the house of Courcy, both of which he felt that he

was man enough to meet. But he forgot to reckon with Frank Gresham, Augusta's brother and heir of Greshamsbury. Frank met Moffat in Pall Mall Street, and administered to him a severe flogging before the entrance of his fashionable club; cutting him with a heavy leather whip, bought especially for this purpose, on his back, on his legs, on his head, and every possible place. It seemed to Mr. Moffat that all London had gathered to witness the beating, so numerous had the crowd become in those few minutes. After this humiliation, Mr. Moffat retired into the country for a while and then went abroad. The severe flogging given to Moffat by Frank Gresham met with Trollope's approval as is shown by the playful manner in which the novelist relates Moffat's anguish. Nor does Trollope attempt to arouse sympathy for Moffat as he does for some of the other wrongdoers.

A second character exposed to humiliation was the Marquis of Trowbridge, who, in The Vicar of Bullhampton, endeavored to show his contempt for those not on a par with him socially, by believing that they could not be right in any matter in which they held a different opinion from him. The Marquis believed Sam Brattle guilty of the murder of his tenant, Mr. Trumbull, because Mr. Fenwick, vicar of Bullhampton, who would not become one of his people, believed him innocent of the murder. Mr Puddleham, the

Methodist minister, was esteemed by the Marquis, as he was one of the Marquis's staunch supporters. In order to show his contempt for Fenwick, the Marquis built a brick chapel for the dissenting Methodist minister, immediately opposite the vicarage gate; which location not only spoiled the view from the vicarage, but proved annoying as well, as all the services could be heard at the vicarage. However, Mr. Quickenham, a clever London lawyer, and brother-in-law to Fenwick, proved that the site of the new chapel belonged, not to the Marquis, but to the vicarage, as it was glebe land. In humiliation, the Marquis had to admit his error before all the Bullhamptonites, including his own tenants. The chapel was torn down, and moved to the site first chosen for it, before the Marquis desired to wreak vengeance on Fenwick. This was humiliation indeed for a marquis.

Lady Laura Kennedy of Phineas Finn and Phineas Redux not only suffered humiliation before her friends after the exposure of her family affairs, but she was also denied a much coveted position. Her suffering, however, was the result of her own folly, as she later realized. "When I was younger I did not understand how strong the heart can be. I should have known it, and I pay for my ignorance with the penalty of my whole life."² Lady Laura's first

2.

Anthony Trollope, Phineas Redux, Vol. II, p. 349.

sin was her marriage to Lord Kennedy, because of his wealth, when her heart belonged to Phineas Finn, a poor, but handsome member of Parliament from Ireland. Her second sin was her selfish wish to retain Finn's love, although her position made her unable to return it. Moreover, she rejoiced too openly in Finn's successes, even after she knew that such enthusiasm was objectionable to her husband. In desperation, she separated herself from her husband, who refused to grant her a divorce, and besides exposed her frailty to all her friends. In addition to this, she was humiliated by numerous innuendos in the "People's Banner," as Mr. Quintus Slide, the editor, was hostile to Phineas Finn. Lord Kennedy, who had always held himself above his acquaintances--he had no friends--became mentally unbalanced and died under the strain. In the meantime, Phineas Finn's love for Lady Laura had waned, and he married a Madame Max Goesler, a rich widow, who loved him, and whom he loved. In despondency and humiliation, Lady Laura lived the life of a recluse, thus paying dearly for her mistake of marrying for money and not for love.

In addition to these examples already cited, Mark Robarts of Framley Parsonage and Lord Fawn of The Eustace Diamonds, Phineas Finn, and Phineas Redux were also humiliated before their friends. Mark Robarts became too

intimately associated with the irresponsible Chaldicotes set and partook of many pleasures unbecoming to a clergyman. During his visit with the Chaldicotes, he became a regular tuft-hunter, which pleasure necessitated his spending money that could be ill spared for pleasure. Robarts allowed Nathaniel Sowerby to become a close friend of his in spite of the fact that Sowerby was an impoverished gentleman who always took advantage of his friends, especially in the matter of loans which Sowerby seemed always to have in abundance. Mark permitted Sowerby to cajole him into signing a note for him for four hundred pounds, which note Sowerby made no effort to redeem. Foolishly enough, Mark signed another note for five hundred pounds to renew the old note, so he thought, but which was actually a new note. In addition to this folly, Mark bought a hunting horse from Sowerby for one hundred and thirty pounds, borrowing the money to do so. Mark became remorseful when he considered that his brief visit with the Chaldicotes set was likely to cost him over a thousand pounds. His visit, when viewed from Framley Parsonage, was a source of great displeasure, as his family, patroness, Lady Lufton, his brother clergymen, and parishioners all felt that he had erred in his association with the wayward Chaldicotes. Mark felt the humiliation of this visit when Mr. Crawley of Hoggstock approached him

on the matter.

I now make bold to ask you, Mr. Robarts, whether you are doing your best to lead such a life as may become a parish clergyman among his parishioners? . . . Are you satisfied to be a castaway after you have taken upon yourself Christ's armour? . . . You become a hunting parson, and ride with a happy mind among blasphemers and mocking devils--You whose aspirations were so high, who have spoken so often and so well of the duties of a minister of Christ. . . . It cannot be that I have had a hypocrite beside me in all those eager controversies! But one who in walking has stumbled in the dark and bruised his feet among the stones. Henceforth let him take a lantern in his hand, and look warily to his path, and walk cautiously among the thorns and rocks, but yet boldly, with manly carriage, but Christian meekness, as all men should walk on their pilgrimage through this vale of tears. ¹

Mr. Crawley's rebuke was adequate punishment for Mark Robarts's sin of waywardness, and one is pleased that Lady Lufton sent the bailiffs away from the parsonage when they came to despoil it, in order to make good those two notes for nine hundred pounds. One feels that Mark Robarts could well afford thereafter to be guided by the wishes of a patroness who would so kindly remove all obstacles to the well being and happiness of his family--obstacles that he had so thoughtlessly erected himself.

In Phineas Redux, Lord Fawn's great sin was his obstinacy and his belief that he could not be mistaken. He declared, swore, and firmly believed that it was Phineas Finn whom he had seen hastening away from the scene of Mr.

1.

Anthony Trollope, Framley Parsonage, pp. 188-89

Bonteen's murder. Moreover, did he not know Phineas's gray overcoat? In spite of the fact that several men of Phineas's build in gray overcoats passed in review before Lord Fawn, he still insisted that Phineas Finn was the man whom he had seen. At the trial, Lord Fawn's evidence almost convicted Phineas, for did not Lord Fawn have an excellent reputation among all his friends? was he not a respected member of Parliament? was it not known by everyone that Phineas Finn and Mr. Bonteen had exchanged angry words only a few minutes before the crime at their fashionable club? and was not Phineas seen leaving the club directly after Mr. Bonteen, not only by Lord Fawn, but by several reliable members of the club? Notwithstanding all the convincing testimony that was given at the trial, Phineas Finn was absolved from all guilt through the interceding of Madame Max Goesler who secured circumstantial evidence to prove that it was not Phineas Finn, but probably Mr. Emilius who committed the murder. Lord Fawn was very much humiliated and chagrined to think that his evidence had almost sent the likable Phineas Finn to the gallows. He found no more pleasure in the occupation that had heretofore been so delightful.

He could have been happy for ever at the India Board or at the colonial office;--but his life was made a burden to him by the affair of the Bonteen murder. He was charged with having nearly led to the fatal catastrophe of Phineas Finn's condemnation by his erroneous evidence, and he could not bear the

accusation. Then came the further affair of Mr. Emilius, and his mind gave way;--and he disappeared.³

Quite frequently Trollope doomed his over-ambitious characters to disappointment in the winning of a coveted honor. Archdeacon Grantly of the Barsetshire series belongs to this group. In The Warden, Dr. Grantly loomed before the reader as a despot determined to make Mr. Harding, his father-in-law, retain his position as warden of Hiram's Hospital, although many false accusations had been brought against Mr. Harding. Like Mr. Obadiah Slope, Dr. Grantly, in Barchester Towers, was forced to withdraw his interest in Hiram's Hospital and concern himself with his own advancement. He was anxious, very anxious, to succeed his slowly dying father as Bishop of Barchester, and he was the choice of the outgoing premier. But, as fate would have it, his father lingered past the term of the old ministry, and his hopes were not fated to be realised, for Dr. Proudie was consecrated Bishop of Barchester. Dr. Grantly was doomed to further disappointment and vexation in his son Henry's choice of a wife. Could not his son do better than to marry Grace Crawley, the poor daughter of a poor clergyman, when he could aspire much higher, considering the backing that an archdeacon of wealth could give his son in a financial and

3.

Anthony Trollope, Phineas Redux, Vol. II, p. 358.

social way? But his son was persistent in his love, and at last Dr. Grantly was forced to receive Grace Crawley into his family circle. Notwithstanding the fact that Archdeacon Grantly was essentially successful, he remained a disappointed man, as he never attained the coveted honor of Bishop of Barchester.

Two other characters who were denied what they greatly desired, marriage with the woman whom they sincerely loved were Harry Gilmore of The Vicar of Bullhampton and Johnny Eames of The Small House at Allington. They belong to the class of persons who are unable to drown their sorrow by bestowing their affection upon someone else, but who remain true to their first love. Harry Gilmore was foolish enough to believe that Mary Lowther could be taught to love him and insisted on trying to teach her to do so, although she had assured him that she did not and perhaps could not ever love him. He was willing to accept Mary as his wife even after he knew that she loved a cousin who had been unfaithful to her. So certain was he that Mary would learn to love him that he was pleased when she half heartedly visited his estate and suggested the changes that she would like to have made in the house. Gilmore's humiliation was in proportion to his insistency, and when Mary Lowther broke her

engagement even after the wedding preparations had been made, Gilmore was too ashamed to appear before his own servants. His short coming had been his persistency in trying to teach Mary to love him. Unlike Lily Dale, however, whom we already admire, Gilmore did not bear his disappointment with fortitude, but he forsook his position as squire of Bullhampton and travelled aimlessly about in an effort to forget his misery.

In a like manner. Johnny Eames was unrequited in his love, although he had loved Lily Dale ardently since childhood. But in the seedy boarding house in Bloomsbury where he was a boarder during his first sojourn in London, his indiscreet actions with Amelia Roper, the landlady's daughter, certainly made him undeserving of the charming Lily Dale. Johnny Eames soon found out that changing boarding houses did not erase his past conduct, and although he tried innocently to declare his love for Lily, his conscience always acted as an unkind reminder of his past conduct. The reader feels that if it is possible for one to pay with a life time for the indiscretions of youth, perhaps Johnny Eames is doing so in having his numerous proposals to Lily Dale rejected. To the end of his days, Eames remained a bachelor, never ceasing, however, to care for Lily Dale, who also remained unmarried after her great disappointment in Adolphus Crosbie.

The revengeful spirit of Mr. Quintus Slide of the "People's Banner" was shown in his persecution of Phineas Finn. Phineas first incurred Quintus Slide's wrath when he refused to allow him to promote his candidacy for election to Parliament in his newspaper. But Phineas believed that a member of Parliament should be altogether independent of the press. In mentioning Phineas's election to the borough of Loughton in the "People's Banner," Slide referred to him as a stick and complete evidence that the Reform Bill of 1832 required to be supplemented by some more energetic measure when such as Phineas could be put into the House.

It was known to everyone that Lady Laura and her husband were estranged, but Quintus Slide was so bold as to attribute the cause of the separation to the interference of Phineas Finn. Moreover, he wanted both Lord Kennedy and Phineas brought to trial for the skirmish that took place between the two at MacPherson's Hotel, at which time Kennedy fired a shot at Phineas. In the article, Mr. Slide also suggested that Phineas should withdraw immediately from public life. Slide had presented a number of untruths in the article, but he had contrived to word it in such a way as not to be subject to libel. However, Mr. Slide was doomed to disappointment for no public or official inquiry was made into the circumstances of the skirmish.

Slide accused Phineas of using his influence to keep Mr. Bonteen from becoming Chancellor of the Exchequer after he had been nominated by his party. Nevertheless, the reader knows that this exclusion from office was the result of more influential interference than that possessed by Phineas Finn. Quintus Slide made the most of the accusation brought against Finn as Mr. Bonteen's murderer and played up all of Finn's past conduct in a very disparaging manner. Slide was utterly disappointed when Phineas was acquitted of the murder. However, Mr. Slide's career as a malicious editor of the "People's Banner" soon terminated for as it was stated in part in Chapter I--

Poetical justice reached Mr. Quintus Slide of the People's Banner. The acquittal and following glories of Phineas Finn were gall and wormwood to him; and he continued his attack upon the member of Tankerville even after it was known that he had refused office, and was about to be married to Madame Goesler. In these attacks he made allusions to Lady Laura which brought Lord Chiltern down upon him, and there was an action for libel. The paper had to pay damages and costs, and the proprietors resolved that Mr. Quintus Slide was too energetic for their purposes. He is now earning his bread in some humble capacity on the staff of the Ballot Box--which is supposed to be the most democratic daily newspaper published in London. Mr. Slide has, however, expressed his intention of seeking his fortune in New York.⁵

The humble position on the staff of the "Ballot Box" was certainly far removed from the editorship of the "People's Banner," and Slide's hopes of becoming a member

5.

Anthony Trollope, Phineas Finn, Vol. II, pp. 358-59.

of Parliament were blasted. He knew he could not launch a successful campaign from the columns of this not highly esteemed paper.

Among the minor characters who were rewarded for their virtue, Madame Max Goesler deserves a place. Although she was not considered the equal of many of the people with whom she associated because of her dubious past, like Lady Mason of Orley Farm. she won the respect of everyone by the fine manner in which she carried herself. It was her unselfish love for Phineas Finn and her belief in his innocence in the matter of the murder of Mr. Bonteen that led her to exert herself in his behalf, which exertion proved to an ever doubting world that Phineas was not the guilty party in the atrocious murder of Mr. Bonteen. She asked no reward for this act of kindness, but out of both love and gratitude, Phineas Finn married her. One feels that Phineas was indeed fortunate to win such an unselfish woman for his wife and that his marriage to her should be a pleasant one, as she possessed both wealth and virtue.

Eleanor Harding ranks among Trollope's virtuous characters who were sorely tried, but who at last won happiness from life. But for a moment only, she was held up to scorn by Archdeacon Grantly in The Warden, because she chose to be friendly towards her father's persecuter, Dr.

John Bold. Nevertheless, after Mr. Harding's resignation as warden of Hiram's Hospital, Eleanor married Dr. Bold, but her happiness was of brief duration, as her husband died within a short time after the marriage. Eleanor's vexation at being misunderstood by her family was mild in The Warden in comparison with the vexation she experienced in Barchester Towers. On the other hand, Dr. Bold of The Warden was less malignant in his actions than Mr. Slope of Barchester Towers, towards whom Eleanor showed some signs of friendliness. Dr. Bold had questioned Mr. Harding's right to receive such a large income from the estate of John Hiram because he was interested in reform, but Mr. Slope had kept Mr. Harding out of his old position as warden of Hiram's Hospital because he wanted to increase his own power of patronage in the diocese. Archdeacon Grantly accused Eleanor of being friendly with the enemy a second time and persecuted her accordingly. However, he declared that he was not going to forgive Mr. Obadiah Slope for his contrivances as he had Dr. Bold, even if Eleanor, his sister-in-law, were to marry him. Although Mr. Harding did not approve of Mr. Slope in many ways, still he made up his mind to try to like Mr. Slope if Eleanor should decide to marry him. Eleanor was distressed by the unhappiness that her actions had caused her family. When she thoroughly understood the villainy

of which Mr. Slope was capable, Eleanor cared no more for him than did the other members of her family. They did not know she had not only refused Mr. Slope's proposal of marriage, but slapped his face in addition. Eleanor surprised them all by marrying Dr. Arabin, Archdeacon Grantly's protégé, towards whom all her family was favorably disposed. Eleanor was very fortunate in this marriage and she enjoyed many happy years as Dr. Arabin's wife.

Doubtless these several examples, which are representative of a large number of this group, will show that Trollope was fairly consistent in his meting out of poetical justice to his minor characters. The wrongdoers received a punishment roughly commensurate with their sin. Such people as Mr. Moffat, the Marquis of Trowbridge, Lady Laura Kennedy, Mark Robarts, and Lord Fawn were subjected to humiliation. On the other hand such persons as Archdeacon Grantly, Harry Gilmore, Johnny Eames, and Quintus Slide were denied a coveted honor, while Eleanor Harding and Madame Max Goesler were rewarded for their virtue. In almost every instance, one can see the working of a kind of justice in the final treatment of the minor characters.

CHAPTER V

FINAL TREATMENT OF THE ESPECIALLY OUTSTANDING CHARACTERS

One important aspect of Trollope's work is quite likely to be overlooked, and that is his treatment of those characters who occupy a position between those who are conspicuously virtuous and those who are wrongdoers. This type of character is especially important in that most persons in real life take this middle road. Hence, Trollope's characterization here has an important bearing on his grasp on reality. It is worthy of note that the characters from Trollope's novels which are most memorable--the ones a reader finds lingering in his memory--belong largely to this type. Consider, for example, Mrs. Proudie, who tried to be, in effect, ruler of the Barchester diocese. She interfered with everything and everyone within her social domain, and asserted her paramount authority in Church matters. Mrs. Proudie was the final dictator in regards to the much disputed appointment of the new warden of Hiram's Hospital. She was not content, however, with just having conquered her opponent, but she wanted Mr. Slope completely annihilated. Not only would she not allow Bishop Proudie to endorse Mr. Slope's candidacy for the position of dean of Barchester, but she would not even al-

low him to retain him as his chaplain. One might consider Mr. Proudie somewhat ridiculous in her outlandish efforts to dictate to the Barchester clergy, until one encounters her in The Last Chronicle of Barset, and becomes fully aware of the fact that she will allow her meddling to cause her to do wrong in order to have her way. One experiences a growing dislike for Mrs. Proudie. Even before Mr. Crawley's trial, Mrs. Proudie always referred to him as a convicted thief. So wrathful was Mrs. Proudie in her condemnation of Mr. Crawley that the bishop was afraid to express his opinion, for had she not already said that no sane man could entertain a doubt as to Mr. Crawley's guilt. Finally, Mrs. Proudie's overzealousness in Church matters caused Bishop Proudie to be over-whelmed with embarrassment before his subordinates, Mr. Crawley and Dr. Tempest, who should have had the highest respect for him. The bishop was so crushed after these two trying experiences that he felt that he did not ever wish to speak again, and he told his wife so. For the first time, Mrs. Proudie felt herself to be disgraced, as all those around her noticed her husband's long absence from the common rooms of the house and his dogged silence at meals. The bishop's total indifference as to the outcome of the affairs of his diocese since his embarrassments, led Mrs.

Proudie to take a momentary stock of her life, and she realized fully that she had failed.

She had loved him dearly, and she loved him still, but knew now,--at this moment felt absolutely sure,--that by him she was hated. . . . She had always meant to serve him. She was conscious of the fact that although she had been industrious, although she had been faithful, although she was clever, yet she had failed. At the bottom of her heart she knew that she had been a bad wife. She had meant to be a good Christian, but she had so exercised her Christianity that not a soul in the world loved her, or would endure her presence if it could be avoided. And now her husband had told her that her tyranny to him was so overbearing that he must throw up his great position. . . . He could no longer endure the public disgrace which her conduct brought upon him in his high place before the world! ¹

Immediately Trollope turns the table, and all one's contempt for Mrs. Proudie changes to compassion with this confession. One is astounded by the sudden announcement that Mrs. Proudie is dead. Her heart, which had been strong enough to persecute others, was too weak itself to stand persecution. The bishop was stunned by the news that left him free. No one could now come uncalled-for into his study, contradict him before those, who were bound to respect his authority, and rob him of all his dignity. The man who had been dependent for such a long time, felt the loss of such a prop, but the bishop found a new support in his chaplain. One's final feeling toward Mrs.

1.

Anthony Trollope, The Last Chronicle of Barset,
Vol. II, pp. 300-301.

Proudie is that of pity, although one feels that her violent death was in some respect the judgment of heaven for her wrongdoings.

Mr. Septimus Harding, the central figure of the Barseshire series, is almost as conspicuously virtuous as any of the heroines whom we have admired in this study, but he lacked stamina, which they possessed in abundance. However, he has been pathetic in his timidity and lack of confidence in himself; he has been praiseworthy in his adherence to his better self and his trust in those whom he loved; he has been gentle and pure in soul and unwilling to blame others for misconduct, even when he has suffered on account of their actions. In The Warden, Mr. Harding resigned his position as warden of Hiram's Hospital because Dr. John Bold had raised a doubt in his mind as to his right to receive such a large income from a charitable institution. He held no malice against Dr. Bold, for he readily sanctioned the marriage of his daughter, Eleanor, to Bold within three months after his resignation from the hospital. Although he was reduced to a small living within the smallest possible parish in the Cathedral close, and although his opulent income had dwindled to seventy-five pounds a year, he was content, for he had been true, as best he knew how, to his better

self. In Barchester Towers, because he refused to bargain for his old position of warden of Hiram's Hospital, he was not returned to it. But a second time he triumphed over his persecutors. Had he not already lived to find much happiness in John Bold's son, when Bold had not even lived to see his son? Was he not offered the position of dean of Barchester, which office Mr. Slope coveted, but never obtained? However, Mr. Harding's timidity did not allow him to accept the position. Nevertheless, he rejoiced to see his future son-in-law, Mr. Arabin, occupying the place of honor.

Mr. Harding had been aimable, sweet, patient, and over-flowing with goodness and simplicity during all his eighty years of life. His death was not one of violence in The Last Chronicle of Barset, as Mrs. Proudie's had been, but he simply took to his bed and was unable to arise from it one morning. He was buried in the cathedral which he had loved so well without pomp or ostentation. Although life had not always given Mr. Harding what he desired, it had given him contentment in large measure. Poetical justice had rewarded Mr. Harding by punishing his persecutors and rewarding those whom he loved, while leaving no vain regrets in his heart. Notwithstanding the fact that one often became provoked with Mr. Harding, still

one admired him as Trollope wished the reader to do; for he says at the close of Barchester Towers:

The Author now leaves him in the hands of his readers; not as a hero, not as a man to be admired and talked of, not as a man who should be toasted at public dinners and spoken of with conventional absurdity as a perfect divine, but as a good man without guile, believing humbly in the religion which he has striven to teach, and guided by the precepts which he has striven to learn. ²

Trollope's most original character is Rev. Josiah Crawley, Perpetual Curate of Hoggstock, who will be remembered for his stoicism. Although Mr. Crawley could not account for his possession of the check which he was accused of stealing, he knew that it must have come into his hands by legitimate means. Mr. Crawley refused to secure legal aid, believing that God would plead his cause. "And even then I will bear my burden till the Lord in his mercy shall see fit to relieve me. Even then I will endure, though a bare bodkin or leaf of hemlock would put an end to it." ³ Mr. Crawley's personality left its impression upon all those with whom he came in contact, and he was one of the few persons before whom Mrs. Proudie quailed. Mr. Crawley relinquished his right to his curacy when his friends suggested that matters could be arranged in his behalf. He wanted no compromise with right or wrong. He believed that he was either innocent or

2. Anthony Trollope, The Last Chronicle of Barset, Vol. I, p. 125.

3. Ibid., pp. 300-301.

guilty, and thereby had a just claim or no claim at all to his curacy. At last all doubt as to Mr. Crawley's innocence was removed through the kind interest of Johnny Eames, who found out that it was Mrs. Arabin, and not Mr. Arabin, as Mr. Crawley had supposed, who had given him the check for twenty pounds. Mr. Crawley became a hero to his friends who had always believed in his innocence, but he became a martyr to them when they learned that he had refused to defend himself because Mr. Arabin had said that he had not given him the check after he had said that he did. Mr. Crawley's sole reason for his conduct was a dogged belief that a subordinate should not dispute his superiors. Both Mr. Crawley and Mr. Arabin were right, for Mrs. Arabin had slipped the check among the bills that her husband had given Mr. Crawley without either of them knowing that she had done so.

Although this unfortunate incident had exposed Mr. Crawley's abject misery to the world, conditions mended for him, and a better preferment, along with his daughter's marriage to Major Grantly, allowed him to take his rightful place among the other clergymen of Barchester.

Again Trollope shows himself actively aware of the element of poetical justice as shown in the final disposi-

tion made of his three most memorable characters. He metes out punishment and reward to them, more or less consistent with their just desserts. Mr. Harding did not possess the moral courage to allow himself to win success in life. Mrs. Proudie stepped out of her role with the result that her husband became a mere puppet and she became, in effect, the ruler of the diocese, but her reign of terror was cut short by sudden death. Mr. Josiah Crawley suffered misery and humiliation because of his obstinancy and aloofness, and happiness only came to him after he had become somewhat softened in his demeanor.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

From the chapters which have preceded, it should be clear that in the scheme of things as conceived by Trollope, punishments and rewards for acts done in the flesh are not to be reserved for hereafter. The hero usually achieves complete success, and always partial worldly success; the villain finds himself in difficulties over his misdemeanors.

In order to make clear the scale of moral values which evidently prevailed in Trollope's mind, it has seemed worth while to indicate in outline form the particular wrongdoings treated in his fiction. In the list which follows, there has been given, first, the name of the act, then the punishment to which it leads, and finally the characters in whose lives can be found illustrations.

I. Defiance of the Moral Code

Violent death	Murder
	Execution
	Heart trouble

Abject misery
Repentance

Captain Myles Ussher
 Feemy Macdermot
 Thaddeus Macdermot
 Henry Thorne
 Carrie Brattle

II. Two-Faced Conduct

Humiliation before friends
 Loss of station
 Denial of a coveted honor
 Loss of property
 Unhappy marriage

Mr. Obadiah Slope
 Lady Lizzie Eustace
 Lady Mason
 Mr. Benjamin

III. Arrogance

Denial of a coveted honor
 Humiliation
 Death
 Defeat in an important undertaking

Mrs. Proudie
 Archdeacon Grantly
 Sir Hugh Clavering
 Parents of the suitors

IV. Exaggerated Pride

Humbleness
 Loss of prestige
 Denial of a coveted honor
 Humiliation

Lady Lufton
 Greshams of Greshambury
 De Courcys of Courcy Castle
 Marquis of Trowbridge

V. Obstinacy

Unhappiness in general
Failure in desired plans
Humiliation
Death

Mr. Josiah Crawley
Mr. Brattle
Harry Gilmore
Lord Kennedy
The Squire of Allington

VI. Selfish Gain

Disappointment in life
Loss of position
Exposure of graft
Humiliation
Unhappy marriage
Ridicule

Mr. Emilius
Mr. Dockwrath
Mrs. Carbuncle
Lady Julia Brazabon
Mr. Prong
Lady Laura Kennedy

VII. Irresponsibility

Loss of fortune
Loss of prestige
Troubled conscience
Humiliation
Ostracism

Phineas Finn
Lord Chiltern
Francis N. Gresham, Sr.
Nathaniel Sowerby
Bernard Amerdroz

VIII. Effrontery

Loss of position
Humiliation

Quintus Slide
Mr. Spooner of Spooner Hall
The Lookalofts

IX. Intemperance

Violent death

Sir Roger Scatchered
Sir Louis Scatchered
Charles Amedroz

X. Over-zealousness

Death
Triumph of the enemy
Defeat in desired plan

Dr. John Bold
Mr. & Mrs. Fenwick
Mr. Camperdown

XI. Snobbery

Disappointment in marriage
Humiliation before the enemy
Loss of prestige

Augusta Gresham
Dr. Fillgrave
Lady Amelia De Courcy

XII. Unfaithfulness in Love

Unhappy marriage
Loss of former buoyancy
Humiliation

Adolphus Crosbie
Mr. Moffat

XIII. Lack of Moral Courage

Loss of position
Humiliation
Lack of respect from subordinates

Bishop Proudie
Mr. Harding

XIV. Over-confidence

Humiliation

Lord Fawn

XV. Insincerity

Loss of position
Defeat
Humiliation

Nathaniel Sowerby

XVI. Jealousy

Triumph of the enemy
Defeat of cherished hopes

The Tappitts of the Brewery

XVII. Waywardness

Disappointment in love

Johnny Eames

XVIII. Ingratitude

Good conditions made worse

Bedesmen of Hiram's Hospital

XIX. Over-ambition

Loss of contentment

Mrs. Grantly

XX. Shirking of Duty

Humiliation

Disgrace brought upon family

Mark Roberts

In a similar manner it is easy to illustrate Trollope's judgment on individual virtues. Below is a second outline indicating these qualities and their rewards deemed suitable for those possessing them.

I. Goodness and Purity of Soul

Happiness in marriage

Wealth

Love and esteem of persecutors

Mary Thorne

Lucy Roberts

Lucy Morris

Rachel Ray

Grace Crawley

Eleanor Harding

Florence Burton

Clara Amedroz

Mary Jones

II. Unselfishness or Lack of Snobbery

Happiness in marriage

Wealth

Prestige

Lord Lufton

Luke Rowan
Major Grantly
Frank Gresham
Harry Claverling

III. Persistency in obtainment of Desired Object

Desired promotion
Happy marriage
Wealth

Mr. Arabin
Mr. Saul
Will Belton
Dr. Crofts

IV. Loyalty to Parents, Family, Friends

Happy marriage
Wealth
Happiness for friends
Success for self

Grace Crawley
Dr. Thorne
Miss Dunstable
Lady Glencora
Fanny Lufton
Mrs. Crawley
Madam Goesler
Miss Thorne
Mary Bold
Mary Belton

V. Self-respect

Contentment
Happiness for loved ones

Mr. Harding

VI. Sincerity

Promotion

Happiness
 Happy marriage
 Success in desired plans

Mr. Quiverful
 Beatrice Gresham
 Mrs. Butler Cornbury

VII. High Principles

Respect of everyone

Lucius Mason

VIII. Courage

Promotion
 Happiness

Mrs. Quiverful

In view of the preceding outline, one might conclude, without fear of contradiction, that Trollope has ever been aware of the element of poetical justice in his fiction. The punishment meted out to the wrongdoers is roughly commensurate with their crime. It is to be noted that Trollope has no patience with vices and punishes the offender in more than one way, oftentimes, according to the harm wrought upon others. There is no malignity in Trollope's punishment of the wrongdoer, for on several occasions, he succeeds in arousing pity for the offender, regardless of the wrongdoing. However, the rewarding of the conspicuously virtuous characters has always been a source of pleasure to Trollope, and he likes to depict his

virtuous characters as overcoming all obstacles to their happiness. Since the larger number of Trollope's virtuous characters are young ladies, a happy marriage seems to be the most befitting reward. With Trollope a good and virtuous character may expect a part of his reward for his goodness in this life on earth. There seems to be, on every hand, a just and equitable law at work in the affairs of men, which supports the moral code, perhaps, more so, than in real life. There have been times that the writer of this thesis has thought that the wrongdoer was not adequately punished, or the virtuous character adequately rewarded, but there has not been a single instance in which either the wrongdoer or the virtuous character has escaped some sort of punishment or reward. In Trollope's scheme of things, men are both punished and rewarded here on earth, as well as in the life hereafter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. FICTION OF ANTHONY TROLLOPE¹Barsetshire Novels

The Warden. London: George Bell and Sons, 1906. 272 pp.

Barchester Towers. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905.
2 volumes.

Doctor Thorne. London: George Bell and Sons, 1906.
631 pp.

Framley Parsonage. London: George Bell and Sons, 1906.
598 pp.

The Small House at Allington. London: George Bell and
Sons, 1906. 2 volumes

The Last Chronicle of Barset. London: George Bell and
Sons, 1906. 2 volumes.

The Macdermots of Ballycloran. N. Y.: John Lane Co., 1906.
623 pp.

Orley Farm. N. Y.: Dodd Mead & Co., 1913. 3 volumes.

Rachel Ray. The World's Classics. London: Oxford University
Press, 1924. 514 pp.

The Belton Estate. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1912. 2 volumes.

The Claverings. The World's Classics. London: Oxford Univer-
sity Press, 1924. 514 pp.

Phineas Finn. The Irish Member. London: George Bell and
Sons, Ltd., 1911. 2 volumes.

The Vicar of Bullhampton. The World's Classics. London:
Oxford University Press, 1924. 527 pp.

The Eustace Diamonds. The World's Classics. London: Oxford
University Press, 1930. 605 pp.

Phineas Redux. London: George Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1911.
2 volumes.

1.

The volumes listed here are those actually used in making
the study, and do not represent first editions.

B. CRITICAL REFERENCES

BOOKS

Escott, T. H. S. Anthony Trollope. His Public Services, Private Friends, and Literary Originals. With a Bibliography of the First Editions of the Works of Anthony Trollope Compiled by Margaret Lavington with Notes Drawn Chiefly from His Autobiography and from Information Kindly Given by His Son, Henry M. Trollope. N. Y.: John Lane Co., 1923. 336 pp.

Harrison, Frederic, Studies in Early Victorian Literature (N. Y.: 1895), pp 183-204.

Quinlan, M. A. Poetic Justice in the Drama. The History of an Ethical Principle in Literary Criticism. Notre Dame, Indiana: University Press, 1912. 219 pp.

Sadlier, Michael, Trollope A Commentary. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1927. 400 pp.

Trollope, Anthony, Autobiography of Anthony Trollope. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905. 319 pp.

Walker, Hugh, Literature of the Victorian Era. (Cambridge at the University Press, 1910), pp 772-776.

Walpole, Hugh, Anthony Trollope. N. Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1928. 199 pp.